

**Remarks**

Applicants thank the Examiner for taking the time on December 19, 2005 to discuss the status of the present matter, and amendment strategy.

In light of the following amendments and discussion, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application. Claims 1, 20, and 26 have been amended. New claims 41-43 have been added. Thus, claims 1-43 are pending of which claims 1, 20, 26, and 42 are independent.

**35 USC §103**

Claims 1-6, 9-10, 12-31, 34-35, 37-40 stand rejected as being obvious over the Netscape collective in view of Goldberg's May 16, 1997 "CS 268 Final Project" (hereafter Goldberg), and Rodriguez.

As discussed with the Examiner, Applicants traversed the rejections based on the Netscape collective since there is no actual proof the documents were publicly available as of the date in the document footer; it will be appreciated any date can be placed in a document, and that date has no bearing on when a document is actually available to the public, e.g., on the Internet. However, since the Examiner located the Netscape collective at the web.archive.org web site with a date of October 2, 1999, Applicants tentatively accept that as a date of publication. Applicants say "tentatively" since the archive.org service is not entirely reliable (content has been known to appear and disappear), hence it is unclear whether the Office's search result is a false positive. Applicants reserve the right to again traverse use of the Netscape reference if it is

learned the web.archive.org service is not reliable, however it is believed need for this is moot over the invention clarification amendments made herein.

### **Claims 1, 20, and 26**

Regarding the rejections of independent claims 1, 20 and 26, it is respectfully submitted that these claims have been amended such that it should be clear how inventive intent differs from the documents relied on by the Office. For example, claim 1 as amended now recites a method for a proxy to transparently provide access to resources of a resource manager, comprising:

receiving from the client a resource locator for retrieving a resource of a **selected resource manager of a set of resource managers disposed within different machines**, wherein the resource locator comprises a network address of the resource manager and the resource locator is at least partially obscured to hide the network address;

de-obscuring the resource locator;

retrieving a first portion of the resource from the resource manager according to the de-obscured resource locator, and a **second portion of the resource from a second selected resource manager** of said set of resource managers according to the de-obscured resource locator; and

providing the resource to the client such that it appears to have originated from the proxy.

(Emphasis added.) It is respectfully submitted that the suggested combination of the Netscape proxy, Goldberg Rewebber, and Rodriguez parallel-access mirroring fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1, 20, 26 as amended.

In particular, it is respectfully submitted that none of these documents, whether considered individually or one in view of the other, teaches or suggests using a resource locator that is at least partially obscured to retrieve a resource from selected resource managers disposed within different machines, in combination with the recited

retrieving including retrieving a second portion of the resource from a **second** selected resource manager of said set of resource managers according to the de-obsured resource locator.

Regarding the other dependent claims 2-6, 9-10, 12-19, 21-25, 27-31, 34-35, 37-40, while these claims introduce limitations further distinguishing claimed embodiments over the documents relied on by the Office, hence these claims are not being substantively reviewed at this time in order to focus prosecution on the allowability of the independent claims. These dependent claims are believed allowable for at least the reason as depending from allowable base claims.

### **Claims 7, 8, 32, 33**

Regarding claims 7, 8, 32, 33, it is respectfully noted that these claims recite a proxy header having a content type identifier identifying a desired format for the resource, where the resource manager stores the resource in a second format different from the desired format but where the resource is converted into the desired first format. It is respectfully submitted these claims as originally filed, e.g., prior to any amendment of claim 1, are allowable over the documents relied on by the Office since the Office fails to show why these four documents, e.g., the Netscape proxy, the Goldberg Rewebber, the Rodriguez parallel, and now the Sasaki published patent application 20010013070 should be combined as suggested.

Applicants respectfully submit this rejection based on four different references is an impermissible piece-meal attack on individual claim elements. In particular, the Sasaki reference deals with conversion of internet data "from a portable information

terminal based on WAP (Wireless Application Protocol)," e.g., a cell phone or such device. As is well understood the Office must do more than simply find individual references that teach some piece of a claim element. Even if we put to the side the impermissible piece-meal rejection of the claim elements, it is respectfully submitted there is no motivation to combine Sasaki as suggested since the claim embodiments **do not** relate to enabling WAP devices as taught in Sasaki, and hence this combination, even if workable as suggested by the Office, would not be obvious or necessarily sensible to one skilled in the art.

### **New Claims 41-43**

New claim 41 adds a transcoding limitation to claim 1; it is believed this is novel in combination with the original claim 1 limitations, and is particularly allowable as currently depending from amended claim 1.

New claim 42 is a variation of claim 1 in which the client is validated for authorization to have an obscured URL de-obscured as recited—there is no such teaching of this in the documents relied on by the Office.

New claim 43 adds transcoding to new claim 42.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections of the independent claims have been overcome as discussed above. Therefore, claims 1-43 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 19, 2005

/ Steven D. Yates # 42,242 /

Steven D. Yates  
Patent Attorney  
Intel Corporation  
(503) 264-6589

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

December 28, 2005

Date of Deposit

Gigi Hoover

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Signature

Gigi Hoover 12-28-05

Date